



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/595,680 | 03/27/2007 | Brian Anthony Retkin | 09999-Murg | 4657 |
| Albert T. Keyack 260 South Broad Street Philadelphia, PA 19102 | | | | |
| 7590 05/07/2009 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| COONEY, ADAM A | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 2444 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 05/07/2009 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Application No. 10/595,680 | Applicant(s) RETKIN ET AL. |
| Examiner ADAM COONEY | Art Unit 2444 |

All Participants: _____ Status of Application: _____

(1) ADAM COONEY. (3) _____.
(2) Albert Keyack, Reg. No. 32,906. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 4 May 2009 Time: _____

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
none

Claims discussed:
none

Prior art documents discussed:
none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative of record, Mr. Albert Keyack, regarding whether or not a response to the most recent office action had been sent. Mr. Keyack stated that he is no longer with the firm and would call the firm in regards to the application and give the examiner a call back. A Mr. Robert McKinley, registered number unknown, from the firm contacted the examiner and left a voice mail stating that the firm has no record of receiving the office action and wanted to know if the examiner would re-issue the office action and re-start the time for reply. The examiner gave Mr. McKinley a call back, at 215-569-4892, and stated that there was nothing of record showing any error in the mailing of the office action and that there would be no reason to re-issue the office action. Mr. McKinley then stated that examiner does have that option to re-issue the office action in rare cases. The examiner told Mr. McKinley he would give him a call back after talking with his supervisor. Examiner gave Mr. Keyack and Mr. McKinley a call back on 05/05/2009 and left a voice mail stating that since Mr. Keyack is the attorney of record, and there is no record of a change in power of attorney, and since the office action was mailed to Mr. Keyack and the time period of reply has reached its statutory 6 month mark that the application is abandoned. Further, the examiner stated that Mr. Keyack could go through the proper channels to file a petition to not abandon the case, provided Mr. Keyack can show proof as to why the application shouldn't be abandoned. Lastly, the examiner stated that he could send a copy of the interview summary and notice of abandonment via fax to Mr. McKinley. Neither Mr. Keyack or Mr. McKinley returned the call. .